

MINUTES

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

July 16, 2007

A meeting of the City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m., Chairman Harold Sanger presiding. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present

Harold Sanger, Chairman
Michael A. Schoedel, City Manager
Steve Lichtenfeld, Aldermanic Representative
Marc Lopata
Scott Wilson

Absent:

Jim Liberman
Debbie Igielnik

Also Present:

Catherine Powers, Director of Planning & Development Services
Jason Jaggi, Planner
Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney

Chairman Sanger welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked that conversations not take place during the meeting and that all cell phone and pager ringers be turned off.

Chairman Sanger introduced the newest member to the Commission, Scott Wilson, who has replaced Mark Zorensky. He thanked Scott for his willingness to serve and indicated that he is pleased to have him serve on this Commission. Chairman Sanger then provided a brief executive profile of Mr. Wilson.

MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING OF JUNE 18TH, 2007

The minutes of the regular meeting of June 18, 2007 were presented for approval. Marc Lopata asked that the third paragraph from the bottom of Page 10 be revised to read: “Marc Lopata stated that “*best practices*” state to minimize windows on the east and west exposures. He suggested increasing the insulation. The minutes were then approved, as amended, after having been previously distributed to each individual member.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT/SITE PLAN REVIEW/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – SECOND UNIT - NEW CONSTRUCTION DETACHED GARAGE W/SECOND STORY LIVING SPACE & VERSALOK WALL – 8023 CRESCENT

Sandy Stoner, owner and Peter Conant, project architect were in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers indicated that the proposed project involves the construction of a new three-car detached garage with living space above the garage. A conditional use permit is required because the structure provides a kitchen, bath, sleeping and living space as designated by the Building Code. The owners have not provided information regarding the use of the second unit; however, conversations with their architect indicate that the second unit will not be occupied permanently. The structure must meet the requirements as contained in the City's Zoning Ordinance, Article 2, Section 2.21. The applicant's plans indicate that the second unit will contain a living room, full bathroom, and a small kitchen. In total, the amount of livable area is approximately 783 square feet. This is below the 1,000 square feet maximum allowed for second dwelling units in the R-2 Residential Zoning District. As proposed the second unit is in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance provisions. Catherine then indicated that the proposed detached garage/second unit is somewhat larger than other detached structures in the area; however, staff believes the proposed project meets all the regulations outlined in the Zoning Ordinance as it pertains to Second Units. Additionally, the applicants have received Subdivision Trustee approval and therefore, staff recommends approval with the stipulations contained in the Zoning Ordinance, Article 2, Section 2.21.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if there are other second units in the R-2 Zoning District.

Catherine Powers indicated that one other was approved, but it was not constructed. Catherine agreed that there are other detached garages in the district but none have living space that she is aware of.

Chairman Sanger asked if there are any concerns.

Catherine stated she believes the concern is who will use the second unit.

Chairman Sanger asked if the proposal meets the requirements set forth in the Zoning Ordinance.

Catherine Powers replied "yes". She stated that second units are only permitted with a Conditional Use Permit in the R-1 and R-2 Districts.

Marc Lopata asked what happens when the property changes ownership.

Chairman Sanger indicated that a deed restriction is filed with the County.

Scott Wilson asked if the neighbors have reviewed the proposal and have given their approval.

Ms. Stoner stated that most agree with the proposal as the very ugly metal awning will be removed.

Chairman Sanger advised Ms. Stoner that only the conditional use permit is being considered at this time.

Note: Kevin O'Keefe arrived at approximately 5:45 p.m.

Mr. Charles Pohle indicated he had a letter outlining concerns he has regarding the proposal. The letter was read and a copy provided to the Recording Secretary for retention in the file. The concerns outlined were 1) the notification of this proposal from the City was received by the Pohle's in their mailbox on Wednesday, July 11th; 2) the Stoners did not discuss their plans with their neighbors and only received Trustee sign-off; 3) how the second unit will be used; there are no other detached units in David Place and that we (the Pohles) will have to look out at an almost 20 foot wall of brick veneer topped with siding; 4: what they (the Stoners) are going to do with all that space; and 5) the carriage house is unsightly that in their opinion should be reduced to a 2 or 3 car garage.

Chairman Sanger commented that with regard to the receipt of the agenda, that there is a deadline to submit material in order to be placed on the Plan Commission/ARB agenda after which time plans are reviewed by staff, and then the agenda is prepared and sent out.

Catherine Powers agreed. She stated that every attempt is made to mail out the agendas on the Monday or Tuesday the week prior to the meeting.

Chairman Sanger commented that he does find it interesting that there are no other second units in Davis Place. He commented that the garage is a permitted use in the district with approval by the ARB and upon issuance of a building permit, but that since the garage contains provisions for living space as defined by our Code, a Conditional Use Permit is required for that living space.

Mr. Carl Pohle, Mr. Charles Pohle's son, stated his concern is with regard to the appearance and compatibility.

Chairman Sanger indicated that those issues will be discussed during the architectural portion of the review process, but that the matter currently before them is consideration of the conditional use permit application for the 2nd unit.

Mr. John Sorkin, 8018 Crescent, asked the projected occupancy of the second unit.

Ms. Stoner replied "none". She stated her intention is to improve the value of the property and the neighborhood and has no intention to rent out the second unit.

Mr. Carl Pohle questioned the square footage of the structure.

Chairman Sanger noted that the total square footage of the structure is 1,408 square feet, with the second story living quarters containing approximately 625 square feet (note that this figure was determined to be correct later during the meeting. Staff's memorandum incorrectly listed the second story to be 783 square feet, which is actually the square footage of the first floor of the structure).

Mr. Carl Pohle commented that this structure, at 19 feet in height, is almost another house.

Mr. Sorkin asked if the footprint of the building is 1,400 square feet.

Chairman Sanger indicated that the 1,400 square feet is the total square footage (both levels).

Mr. Charles Pohle commented that if Ms. Stoner sells the property, there is a chance that the second unit could be occupied by a grounds keeper or a relative.

Catherine Powers agreed.

Mike Schoedel asked if there are other similar situations in Clayton.

Catherine Powers replied “yes”. She stated that many of them are on Southmoor.

Mr. Carl Pohle asked how they are policed.

Chairman Sanger indicated that the neighbors would police the situation and report any non-compliance to the City’s Police Department.

Mr. Carl Pohle commented that the other areas of Clayton that have second units are totally different neighborhoods.

Mike Schoedel stated that there are many similar garages in the City with attic space that could be renovated to living space.

Catherine Powers agreed. She stated that a conditional use permit would be required for those as well.

Marc Lopata referred to an earlier comment regarding the lack of other second units. He asked if this would be precedent setting if it were approved.

Ms. Stoner commented that she believes there are other garages in the area that contain living space.

Catherine Powers stated that staff is not aware of others in Davis Place.

Kevin O’Keefe stated that this use is available in the district in which it is located per the Zoning Ordinance. He stated with regard to precedence, each application for a conditional use permit is considered on its own merit.

Marc Lopata asked if the space is used as office space (i.e. business), would there be a zoning issue.

Kevin O’Keefe commented that the City has requirements for home occupations.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to recommend approval of the conditional use permit to the Board of Aldermen with the stipulations recommended by staff. The motion was seconded by Mike Schoedel and received unanimous approval.

The site plan portion of the project was now up for review.

Catherine Powers explained that the applicant is proposing to construct a 1 ½ story, 3-car detached garage with living space on the upper level. Access to the second unit will be provided via a doorway to the front of the garage. Total square footage is 1,408 with a height of 19 feet, 9 inches from existing grade to the peak of the roof (pursuant to the zoning ordinance definition of height as measured from existing grade to the mean roof height, the structure is 14 feet in height, which is below the 20 feet maximum allowed). As proposed, the structure meets the setback requirements of a minimum of 5 feet from the rear and side property lines. With regard to impervious coverage, the plans indicate that impervious coverage with the detached garage will be 53.8% and will occupy 30.9% of the rear yard area. The plans indicate that the driveway will be re-graded to match the level of the neighboring driveway. This re-grading will require that some work be made on a small portion of the neighbor's property (8021 Crescent), for which approval from the neighboring property owner has been obtained. Catherine stated that since there is no storm sewer available, the applicant is proposing to pipe all downspouts from the garage, three downspouts from the house and the driveway trench drain to an outlet in the front yard. The plans show that the proposed pipe to collect all of this storm water would be 4-inches in diameter. Staff believes the pipe should be larger. A new trash enclosure is proposed on the west side of the garage and will be screened with a wooden fence. The HVAC unit servicing the second unit will be located on the northeast corner of the lot, approximately 5-feet away from the property line and is proposed to be screened with evergreens; however, staff believes that due to the placement far back on the lot, that it should be screened with a fence as well. Catherine stated with regard to the landscape plan, one 10-inch deciduous tree will be removed to accommodate the new structure. The applicant is proposing caliper inch replacement with five, 2-inch Bradford Pear Trees; however, staff does not believe that Bradford Pear Trees are appropriate. Staff is of the opinion that the proposal meets the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance in terms of setbacks, impervious coverage and rear yard coverage and that while a storm sewer is not available, the applicant has mitigated the impact to adjacent properties by collecting the run-off and directing it to the front yard and then to the street. Staff does, however, have concerns with the small size of the storm water pipe and the selection of replacement trees and requests that the HVAC unit be screened with a wood fence and therefore, recommends approval of the site plan with the following conditions:

- 1) That the size of the pipe collecting storm water from the downspouts and trench drain be enlarged per staff review and approval; and
- 2) That a revised landscape plan be submitted to eliminate the Bradford Pear Trees in favor of a higher quality deciduous tree for staff review and approval; and
- 3) That the HVAC unit for the second unit be screened with a wood fence and shown on a revised site plan for staff review and approval.

Mr. Peter Conant, architect, presented a site plan to the members. He indicated that the existing grade is 2 feet lower in the rear yard and will lower the finished grade of the garage. He advised the members that the Davis Place Trustees have signed off on the plans. He stated the garage will be 48" below grade and therefore, the perceived height of the garage will be lower than that of a 2 car garage. He stated they are proposing a trench drain to the front of the building that

will run to the front yard. He stated he would like to remove the two downspouts from the building so as to reduce the burden on the pipe.

Chairman Sanger asked about re-grading.

Mr. Conant stated they will re-grade to the neighbor's property.

Chairman Sanger asked the slope of the driveway.

Mr. Conant stated the slope will be no more than 5%. He stated the pipe slope is at 1% which is an engineering standard. He stated with regard to the tree, he does not believe it will be impacted that much by construction as the existing carport is only a couple feet from it.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the entire back yard will be re-graded.

Mr. Conant replied "yes". Photographs of the property were presented.

Mr. Carl Pohle asked that the photographs be marked as exhibits.

Chairman Sanger stated that this Commission does not operate that way.

Mr. Carl Pohle asked Chairman Sanger if he is denying his request.

Chairman Sanger replied "yes".

Steve Lichtenfeld referred to the drain valve as shown on the plans.

Denny Mulinex of D & R Contracting stated that the back yard (northwest) corner now all slopes to the house and will be re-graded to flow to various locations. He stated the amount of water is not increasing.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if more water will flow to the property to the east.

Mr. Mulinex replied "no".

Chairman Sanger asked if staff finds the drainage plan acceptable.

Catherine Powers stated that the plans that were submitted to staff were not as detailed as what is being explained this evening.

Marc Lopata indicated that he has several issues with the site elevations. He asked for a grading plan as he does not see how this proposal will mitigate storm water.

Mr. Conant asked if Marc wants to see graphic topographical lines.

Marc Lopata replied "yes". He stated the corners of the house are lower than the front yard. He asked that the site plan be continued to provide the applicant an opportunity to prepare a grading plan.

Mike Schoedel asked if staff recommends a larger drain pipe.

Catherine Powers indicated that staff believes that 4" is not adequate.

It was mentioned, and determined, that the first floor of the garage is 783 square feet, with the second level being 625 square feet, contrary to staff's memorandum.

Ms. Mary Burrows, 6633 San Bonita, asked why water run-off is not going to a storm sewer.

Chairman Sanger advised Ms. Burrows that there is no storm sewer available.

Mr. Conant stated he is attempting to improve on the current situation and believes he still only needs a 1" slope for the front pipe.

Chairman Sanger commented that he believes Marc's earlier request for a proper drainage/grading plan is appropriate.

Marc Lopata stated he has several concerns with regard to the project, as follows: 1) front water discharge penetrating the ground before it comes in contact with impervious coverage; 2) more run-off; and 3) that the nearest storm water inlet is 400 feet away. Marc then reiterated his previous motion to table. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and received unanimous approval by the Commission.

The architectural aspects of the project were now up for review.

The question of whether to table the architectural review aspects of the project or discuss them now was brought up.

Mike Schoedel suggested allowing the applicant to proceed with their architectural review presentation in the event there are issues with that part of the approval process as well.

Catherine Powers explained that the proposed structure will be brick to match the primary residence. The front and rear facing dormers will be fiber-cement siding. The architect has submitted exterior material calculations for the detached structure and the rear (north) elevation exceeds the architectural review guidelines for siding as a secondary material. The plans show the north elevation to have 33% siding. Given that a significant amount of the structure is below grade on this elevation and that siding is only proposed for the dormer, staff believes that the amount of siding is acceptable; however, to mitigate the appearance of siding as viewed from the adjacent property to the north, staff would prefer that an additional window be placed on the dormer to create a more balanced appearance. A modular block retaining wall for the front yard along the driveway is also being proposed. Work on this retaining wall was stopped by a city inspector due to the Versalok material, which is not an approved material for front yard retaining walls. The specifications provided for this Versalok wall indicate that the color is charcoal gray with a "weathered" texture. As currently installed, this retaining wall contains several step-downs as the grade lowers from the driveway near the house toward the middle of the yard. Catherine stated that the design of the detached garage/second unit matches that of the primary

structure; however, staff would recommend that an additional window be placed on the dormer on the north elevation due to the amount of siding. Staff also has concerns with the appearance of the Versalok wall, as modular block is not an approved material for front yards and that the dark gray color does not match the residence. Staff would prefer the use of brick or natural stone to compliment the residence and that if modular block is approved, staff recommends the use of a higher quality product such as Belgard. Staff recommends approval with the conditions that a third window be added proportionately to the north (rear) dormer for ARB approval, and that the dark gray Versalok retaining wall be removed in favor of brick or natural stone, but if a modular block wall is approved, that it be of a higher quality product, such as Belgard.

Mr. Conant stated he can create a more balanced dormer and that the design has been modified pursuant to staff's recommendations to include the addition of a third window on the north (rear) elevation, enlarging some existing windows and the addition of shutters.

Catherine Powers advised the members that staff has not seen the revisions.

Chairman Sanger stated that excess siding is not typically approved.

Ms. Stoner presented a photograph of the foundation of her house. She stated the Versalok wall being installed is less than 12 feet in length and about 2 ½ feet tall. A picture of the wall was also presented along with a Versalok wall that was installed four properties down from her.

It was noted that her wall will be anchored and pinned and that it faces sideways (facing the driveway).

Marc Lopata asked if the wall is only along the driveway.

Ms. Stoner replied "yes".

Mike Schoedel asked if it will be capped.

Ms. Stoner replied "yes".

Mike Schoedel commented that this is not your typical Versalok wall; he stated the one down the street looks "bad".

Chairman Sanger stated he thinks the wall looks "okay".

Catherine Powers reminded the members that modular block wall systems are specifically called out as not being a permitted wall material in the ARB Guidelines, but that Belgard has been approved.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that Belgard looks more like natural stone and that although the tumbled appearance is better, all the pieces are the same size.

Chairman Sanger advised the applicant that the City appreciates their investment to the property. He then suggested tabling the ARB as well, but asked that the other members give their input.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated he would prefer that the wall replicate the stone foundation of the primary structure (the stone foundation contains various sizes of stone and is a lighter color) rather than the proposed darker Versalok.

Marc Lopata stated he agrees with Steve's comment.

Mr. Carl Pohle asked Marc for his full name.

Marc Lopata provided his full name to Mr. Pohle.

Mr. Carl Pohle thanked Marc for bringing up important issues regarding this proposal.

Chairman Sanger commented that this Commission/Board is not the same in its proceedings as the Board of Adjustment.

Mike Schoedel stated he is okay with the wall.

Marc Lopata stated that more reveal on the cap may help the appearance of the wall.

Scott Wilson stated he would feel differently about the wall if it were longer; however, he would like to see a more natural wall similar to the house foundation.

Being no further questions or comments, Mike Schoedel made a motion to table. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and received unanimous approval of the Board.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – 190 CARONDELET PLAZA, SUITE 178 – SHOW ME GOLF D/B/A GOLFTEC

Mr. Jon Levey, Principal of Show Me Golf, LLC, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that Mr. Levey is requesting a Conditional Use Permit for the operation of a golf academy at the subject location. A conditional use permit is required in the HDC High Density Commercial District for academies as well as health clubs. Catherine stated that the business will occupy a portion of the first floor of the multi-tenant building. The tenant space measures approximately 2,599 square feet and proposed hours of operation are Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. and Saturday and Sunday from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The business will consist of a lobby/retail area and two instruction rooms. Nine parking spaces are provided in the Plaza garage on a monthly basis. The number of spaces meet the requirement for commercial parking, however, parking must be provided throughout occupancy. Signage has not been submitted. Catherine stated that staff's recommendation is to recommend approval of the conditional use permit with the conditions that the nine (9) parking spaces be retained throughout occupancy and that any signage be approved by the City prior to installation.

Mr. Levey introduced himself to the members. He stated that Show Me Golf, LLC is the nation's largest provider of golf lessons. Their company provides one on one lessons by PGA professionals. He stated the lessons take place in bays within the tenant space indoors and that they are anticipating a total of 3 bays. He stated the company has locations in a total of 30 states

currently. He indicated that he believes this service will be an amenity and is happy to answer any questions the members may have.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked where in the building his business will be located.

Mr. Levey stated just west of Luciano's.

Ms. Burrows asked if a golf ball is actually "hit".

Mr. Levey replied "yes"; he stated the balls are hit into nets.

Being no further questions or comments, Mike Schoedel made a motion to recommend approval of the conditional use permit to the Board of Aldermen. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and unanimously approved by the members.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – ADDITION TO SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 7601 SHIRLEY DRIVE

Mr. Brian Smith, owner/architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that this is a request for a two-story, 870 square foot addition to the existing single family residence. The addition will be placed above an existing below grade garage and roof deck. The existing home is representative of a Tudor design and the alterations will match this style. The exterior materials feature brick to match existing. Wood siding is located on the gables and the dormer also to match the style of the existing residence. The windows will be steel to match existing. Some of the original windows will be salvaged and re-used on the new addition. The plans show the roof line of the addition to match the existing home and will contain slate shingles to match existing. The addition complies with the front yard and side yard setback provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and will not increase the footprint of the residence. The applicant has obtained Wydown Forest Subdivision Trustee approval for the addition. Impervious coverage is not being increased since the addition is atop the existing below grade garage and staff recommends approval as submitted.

Chairman Sanger asked if this is a front addition.

Steve Lichtenfeld indicated that this is a corner lot and the addition is on the Edgewood side.

Chairman Sanger commented that the property has a lot of landscaping.

Mr. Smith presented a site plan as well as elevations of the Shirley and Edgewood sides.

Chairman Sanger asked if the addition will be placed over the existing garage.

Mr. Smith replied "yes". He

Chairman Sanger asked about materials.

A sample of the brick was shown. A color rendering of the addition as seen from the north was also presented.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated he thinks the addition looks great.

Mr. David Bales, 419 Carswold, stated that in his 36 years, he has seen only one addition that is truly super and this is it. He stated the old addition to this house blended seamlessly and looks part of the original structure.

Being no further questions or comments, Marc Lopata made a motion to approve as submitted, seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and unanimously approved by the Board.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – EXTERIOR RENOVATIONS – 7701 & 7733 FORSYTH BOULEVARD (PIERRE LACLEDE)

Mr. Bob Winters, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers indicated that the following projects are being requested:

7701 Forsyth Tower

Significant site work is proposed to the 7701 plaza area. A reconfigured entrance is proposed and a new at-grade plaza entrance on the corner of Forsyth and Hanley is also proposed. The prominent corner entrance will contain water features, new landscaping and a new building monument sign. The existing clock tower will be removed to accommodate the new plaza entrance. The existing steps from the sidewalk leading to the plaza will be reconfigured with new steps and planter beds. In addition, the plaza will contain new limestone and granite pavers.

7733 Forsyth Tower

The applicant is proposing to install a new building entrance and stairway from the sidewalk. The stairway will be flanked with new limestone planters. The existing stairway entrance will be replaced with an ADA accessible ramp. The new ramp will also contain a new planting bed. The walkway on the west side of the building adjacent to the alley between City Hall will be reconfigured to allow an expansion of the planting beds and the installation of several river birch trees.

Signage

Three new monument signs and new building entry signs are proposed. A new monument sign is proposed within the planting area facing Forsyth Boulevard. The applicant indicates that the monument signs will have granite bases and granite faces. Each tower will have a multi-tenant monument sign with a black granite panel as the background. The metal tenant letters will be stem mounted which the applicant indicates will be removable. The plans indicate the size of these two signs to be 8 square feet each.

A larger general building sign is proposed at the entrance to the plaza on the corner of Hanley and Forsyth. The proposed sign will be constructed of a black granite panel with a

metal fabricated to have the logo and letters in relief. The size of the proposed sign is 25 square feet.

Each building entrance will have a 8.5 square foot wall sign with the building name, Pierre Laclede I and Pierre Laclede II. The signs will be individual metal letters in contrast to the background panel.

Catherine indicated that staff recommends approval with the condition that sign permits be issued for the monument sign and building entry signs prior to installation.

Mr. Winters provided a brief explanation of the project. He stated that the owners desire to “open up” the corner and enhance the presence of the building.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked where the street addresses are located.

Mr. Winters indicated that they are located inside the glass above each entrance and are visible from the outside.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the east facing doors on the 7733 building will be retained.

Mr. Winters replied “yes”.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked about the dark line on the plan sheet.

Mr. Winters indicated that the line represents a new partition for new retail space.

Chairman Sanger commented that it is a great update.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve per staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mike Schoedel and received unanimous approval of the Board.

AMENDMENT TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PLANS – 6451 CLAYTON ROAD (DEMUN POINTE MIXED USE PROJECT)

Mr. Tyler Stephens, Core 10 Architecture, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers stated that the following changes to the previously approved plan are being requested:

1. Change green diamond shaped metal roof to a recycled composite rubber roof material in alternating patterns of green and two variations of gray.
2. Change proposed brick panel to full masonry brick in the same color as previously approved.

3. Change the approved composite material on the upper back wall to fiber cement lap siding.
4. Add stone surrounds to the windows.
5. Add an opening in the east wall to provide ventilation for the garage.

Catherine indicated that staff believes that the full brick, use of concrete lap siding and stone surrounds for the windows are all improvements to the original plan and that the request for the rubberized roofing material is also an improvement, particularly since it is in keeping with the LEED Standards. The roof product carries a 50 year warranty and in tests conducted by the Miami-Dade Building Department, withstood hurricane force winds. The pattern, however, appears “busy” and the developer may want to use one or two colors rather than the proposed three colors. Staff understands the need to meet Code for garage ventilation, but would request mitigation for the property to the east. Therefore, staff recommends approval with the conditions that 1) a more subtle pattern for the roof be considered; and 2) upright evergreens be added on the east side of the wall to screening neighboring property.

Mr. Stephens stated that with regard to the roofing material, the previously requested and approved material was aluminum. He indicated that they did research various materials with LEED Certification and studies of variations of colors and patterns and believe the 3 color pattern of recycled composite rubber roof they are now proposing (50% green; 25% gray & 25% different shade of gray) is the best. He believes the color combination will be subtle and help soften the building and that the gray colors “absorb” the green. He stated that the diamond pattern and scale is as was approved previously. He stated that with regard to the brick, they have decided to go with a full-size brick. He stated that also, with regard to the composite material for the upper portion of the back wall, they would like to change it to Hardie Board siding that is painted versus pre-finished. He stated that they feel this is a little more in keeping with the residential neighborhood and will only be used in the gables and eaves. He stated that with regard to the window surrounds, the previously approved material was metal but that it is actually less expensive to use real pre-cast stone. He indicated that the stone will be 4” around each window. Tyler then stated that they always had a vent opening on the east wall but that previously it blew out onto the neighbor’s property and so they have relocated it to the north.

Chairman Sanger asked for clarification that they are asking to move the vent opening from the east to the north.

Mr. Stephens stated it still faces north but is now inside the ramp and will blow out onto the ramp versus the yard.

Catherine Powers stated that staff’s position is that there is no problem relocating the vent as proposed.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the new roofing material will be lower reflective than the previously approved aluminum.

Mr. Stephens replied “yes”.

Marc Lopata asked about LEED credit for the roof.

Mr. Stephens stated he did not know.

Chairman Sanger commented that this new roofing material is a recycled product.

Mr. Stephens agreed.

Marc Lopata asked why they are now requesting full brick.

Mr. Stephens indicated that it was discovered that full brick is actually less expensive than the thin brick.

Ms. Burrows asked Mr. Stephens if they looked at or considered clay tiles for the roof.

Mr. Stephens explained to Ms. Burrows the cost situation.

Ms. Burrows commented that roofing needs to last a very long time and that although she heard this roofing material lasts 50 years, she questions its durability. She asked if the roof is resistant to squirrels. She stated she likes the changes being proposed and that the owners of the property to the east are out of town and could not be here, but that they are pleased that the vent will now blow onto the ramp versus the yard. She stated her main concern is the durability of the roof.

Chairman Sanger asked about experience with the product.

Catherine Powers stated that Clayton has no experience with it but that during internet research of the product, it is used in Miami and Texas.

Mr. Stephens stated it is a Carlisle product, which is nationally recognized.

Marc Lopata asked if the roof pattern is similar to the aluminum roofing that was previously approved.

Mr. Stephens replied "yes"; he stated it (the pattern) is identical.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve as revised (submitted). The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and unanimously approved by the Board.

REVISION TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PLANS – NEW CONSTRUCTION – SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE - 321 N. BEMISTON

Mr. Barry Simon, owner/developer, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that the residence was approved in December, 2006 with a master bedroom on the first floor resulting in one story at the rear of the structure. Recently, the buyer has requested that the master bedroom be located on the second story. This revision has significantly changed the design of the structure. The roofline on the front elevation (left side) has

been eliminated. The roof lines are now fewer and a brick chimney has been added to the right side of the structure. The bump-out on the right elevation, to be constructed in siding, has been eliminated and two windows added. A full second story has replaced a portion of the roof with windows placed along the left elevation. The entrance archway has been replaced with a simple opened porch with a small roof above. The rear of the building now contains a full second story replacing what was previously a sloping roof. A covered porch has been added above the French doors which have been widened from the original application. Catherine stated that staff believes these revisions are an improvement resulting in less and cleaner rooflines and a more balanced design and therefore, recommends approval as submitted (revised).

Mr. Simon thanked the Board for the opportunity to present these proposed revisions. He stated these changes are at the purchaser's request. Elevations of the previously proposed design and elevations of the revised design were shown to the members. Mr. Simon indicated that he brought back samples of the brick and roofing material in the event the members would like to see them again. He stated the square footage of the structure is 3,467 and still contains a 2-car front entry garage. He stated the house is still an all-brick house.

Mike Schoedel advised the other members that these changes were submitted for possible administrative approval, but it was felt that since the design changed quite significantly, that it would be more appropriate to bring it to this Board for review.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated he agrees with staff in that this design is better.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve as submitted (revised). The motion was seconded by Mike Schoedel and received unanimous approval of the Board.

Being no further business for the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board, this meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Recording Secretary